

fw



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
 United States Patent and Trademark Office
 Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
 P.O. Box 1450
 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/777,204	02/05/2001	Jack Ray Caughran	50001-10200	3037
47377	7590	07/15/2005	EXAMINER	
JENNER & BLOCK LLP ONE IBM PLAZA CHICAGO, IL 60611			CHO, UN C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2687	
DATE MAILED: 07/15/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/777,204

Applicant(s)

CAUGHRAN ET AL.

Examiner

Un C Cho

Art Unit

2687

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 October 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 19 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 and 20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 July 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 2, 6 – 12, 16 – 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dunko et al. (US 6,553,236) in view of Fitch et al. (US 6,424,840).

Regarding claim 1, Dunko discloses a method for obtaining geographical zone data for a mobile subscriber unit, the method comprising the steps of (A) a geographical layer interface receiving a request from an application for geographical zone data for the mobile subscriber unit (receiving a request from an affinity group member for geographical zone data for the remote members, Dunko, Col. 9, lines 19 – 21), wherein the request includes: a mobile subscriber identifier that is associated with the mobile subscriber unit (addressing information, Dunko, Col. 9, line 27), which inherently includes a mobile subscriber identifier that is associated with the remote members); and a zone type of a plurality of predefined zone types, wherein the zone type identifies a type of predetermined geographical area (sensed geocoordinates are being used to identify the location of a particular mobile terminal and that its coordinates are translated into a precise location place-name description according to the position where the mobile terminal is located, Dunko, Col. 9, lines 33 – 47); and

(B) returning a reply to the request, wherein the reply includes: a zone identifier that identifies a current geographical area where the mobile subscriber unit is located (location place-name that identifies a current geographical area where the mobile subscriber unit is located, Dunko, Col. 7, lines 39 – 41) and the current geographical area has the zone type included in the request (Dunko, Col. 9, lines 31 – 32).

However, Dunko as applied above does not specifically disclose wherein a zone manager coupled to the geographical layer interface receives the request; a location manager coupled to the zone manager delivers a location of the mobile subscriber unit as determined by a position determination equipment; and the zone manager uses the location of the mobile subscriber unit and a database of zone data to determine the zone identifier. In an analogous art, Fitch discloses a location system (Fig. 2, 84) (geographical layer interface) receiving a request, a location based zone assignment system (Fig. 2, 52) (zone manager) coupled to the location system, a location based zone assignment system, inherently having a location manager, determines the location of the mobile subscriber unit (Fitch, Col. 7, lines 12 – 14), and the location based zone assignment system uses the location of the wireless communication device and a current network topology to determine the operating zone the wireless communication device is operating during the call (Fitch, Col. 8, lines 49 – 56). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the technique of Fitch to the system of Dunko in order to provide an

improved location data provisioning and management in a wireless communication network through the use of dynamic location-based zone assignment for a wireless communication network that substantially reduces or eliminates difficulties that may deter full implementation of certain applications or result in errors or application downtime in adapting to the changing wireless communication network.

Regarding claim 2, Dunko in view of Fitch as applied to claim 1 above discloses a network ID that identifies the mobile switching center serving the subscribers (Dunko, Col. 3, lines 62 – 64).

Regarding claim 6, Dunko in view of Fitch as applied to claim 1 above discloses that the remote members comprising one of a cellular phone, pagers, and personal digital assistants (Dunko, Col. 3, lines 13 – 16).

Regarding claim 7, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 6.

Regarding claim 8, Dunko in view of Fitch as applied to claim 1 above discloses that the present location of remote members identifies one of a shared location place-name description (Dunko, Col. 8, lines 19 – 23).

Regarding claim 9, Dunko in view of Fitch as applied to claim 1 above discloses that the present location of remote members comprises a request to create a new location place-name description (Dunko, Col. 8, lines 26 – 27).

Regarding claim 10, Dunko in view of Fitch as applied to claim 1 above discloses that the reply includes a location place-name description with the present location of remote members (Dunko, Col 7, lines 59 – 65).

Regarding claim 11, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 1.

Regarding claim 12, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 2.

Regarding claim 16, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 8.

Regarding claim 17, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 9.

Regarding claim 18, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 10.

Regarding claim 20, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 1.

3. Claims 3 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dunko in view of Fitch as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Serbetciouglu et al. (US 5,719,918).

Regarding claim 3, Dunko in view of Fitch as applied to claim 1 above does not specifically disclose that the request is a transaction control application protocol message and the reply is a transaction control application protocol

message. In an analogous art, Serbetcioglu discloses that the request and reply is done by Transaction Capability Application Part (TCAP) protocol (Serbetcioglu, Col. 1, lines 28 - 33). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the technique of Serbetcioglu to the modified system of Dunko and Fitch in order to provide a method and apparatus using the existing short message signaling mechanisms of a cellular telephone network to exchange information between a plurality of POS terminals, destinations or sources in a secure environment and also to respond to query from a terminal in a timely fashion.

Regarding claim 13, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 3.

4. Claims 4, 5, 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dunko in view of Fitch and further in view of Serbetcioglu as applied to claim 3 above, and further in view of Jampolsky et al. (US 6,625,437).

Regarding claim 4, Dunko in view of Fitch and further in view of Serbetcioglu as applied to claim 3 above does not specifically disclose that the request is received over one of a Internet protocol network and a signaling system seven network and the reply is returned over one of a Internet protocol network and a signaling system seven network. In an analogous art, Jampolsky discloses that the request is received over one of a TCP/IP and a SS7 network and the reply are returned over one of a TCP/IP and a SS7 network (Jampolsky,

Col. 4, lines 64 – 67). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the technique of Jampolsky to the modified system of Dunko, Fitch and Serbetciouglu in order to provide a wireless telecommunications network that is operable to collect and report data relating to the status and use of a wireless phone or other telecommunication device in rear real-time in response to data collection requests made by subscribers or other authorized persons.

Regarding claim 5, Dunko in view of Fitch, further in view of Serbetciouglu and further in view of Jampolsky discloses that the request is received via a message defined by a GSM standard (Dunko, Col. 3, lines 19 – 22).

Regarding claim 14, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 4.

Regarding claim 15, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 5.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 10/4/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant presented the argument that the reference provided by the examiner fails to disclose a zone type of a plurality of predefined zone types, wherein the zone type identifies a type of predetermined geographical area. The

examiner disagrees with the argument presented by the applicant and the reasoning is as followed.

The reference by Dunko discloses that sensed geocoordinates are being used to identify the location of a particular mobile terminal and that its coordinates are translated into a precise location place-name description according to the position where the mobile terminal is located (Dunko, Col. 9, lines 33 – 47), therefore, the office action mailed on 6/15/2004 holds.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Un C Cho whose telephone number is (571) 272-7919. The examiner can normally be reached on M ~ F 8:00AM to 4:30PM.

Art Unit: 2687

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lester Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-7922. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Un C Cho
Examiner
Art Unit 2687

6/28/05 UC

7/11/05
LESTER G. KINCAID
PRIMARY EXAMINER